



REMARKS CONCERNING THE AMENDMENTS

The above amendments have been made in an effort to more clearly define the present invention and to respond to issues raised in the rejection. Claim 5 has been incorporated into claim 1 in its entirety to place the allowable claim into condition for allowance. This also renders claims 6-8 redundant, so they have been cancelled.

Claim 10 was amended to remove a number of informalities that were discovered on review.

Claim 12 had been objected to because of the relative position of the formulae and their reference, but this may have been a pagination error in the claim. The printout of the claim shows the formulae in the correct position relative to the claim statement.



REMARKS CONCERNING THE REJECTIONS

The above amendment has been made to more clearly define the present invention and to respond to issues raised in the Office Action. Applicant respectfully submits that the above amendments place the application in condition for allowance. All rejected claims have effectively been cancelled or limited to the subject matter of original claim 5, which had been indicated as allowable. Claims that had been previously rejected (which were dependent from rejected claims, such as original claim 1) have now been made dependent from claim 1 which includes the basis of allowability indicated for claim 5. As such, all claims now depend from an allowable claim, and all claims should be allowed.

If a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any issues concerning this communication, please contact Applicant's attorney of record, Mark A. Litman at (952) 832-9090.

Respectfully submitted,

XUZH QIN

By His Representatives,

MARK A. LITMAN & ASSOCIATES, P.A.
York Business Center, Suite 205
3209 West 76th Street
Edina, Minnesota 55435
(952) 832-9090

Date: 27 October 2003

By: 

Mark A. Litman
Reg. No. 26,390

RECEIVED

NOV 05 2003

TC 1700